


**REMARKS**

Applicant notes that the Examiner has repeated in main final the rejection of claim 5 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner's reference to the sixth paragraph of § 112 is however more appropriate. Despite this however neither the second nor sixth paragraph of § 112 mandates use of the proposition "for". Accordingly, the Examiner's continued rejection of claim 5 is improper.

In an effort to remove this issue however Applicant submits herewith an amendment of claim 5 inserting the proposition "for". Entry of this amendment is proper under rule 116 (b) because entry of the amendment removes one outstanding issue, facilitates the Appeal, and places the claim in better form for purposes of the Appeal. Moreover, no further search and no further consideration are necessitated.

No fee is incurred by this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert E. Bushnell, Esq.  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1511 "K" Street N.W., Suite 425  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 638-5740

Folio: P53706  
Date: February 5, 1997  
I.D.: REB/JDC